

RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

AUG 09 2007

REMARKS

Claims 1, 4, 5, 7-9, 11, 12, 14, 15 and 23-25 are still pending in this application.  
Reconsideration of the application is earnestly requested.

The Examiner is thanked for the telephone interview of November 8, 2006. In that interview, it was discussed how the alphanumeric message not only is a command input to the smart card, but that it also controls operation of the smart card (inherently, a command is a control feature).

Claims 1, 7, 11, 14 and 23

Each of claims 7, 11, 14 and 23 require that a smart card command is implemented as an alphanumeric message integrated within a standard SMS message. In this fashion, a remote terminal may load the smart card or transact a purchase with the smart card just as if the smart card were inserted into the remote device. The commands intended for the smart card are cleverly inserted into an SMS message so that they may be transmitted over a wireless telecommunications network to the mobile telephone and thence to the smart card attached. This feature is neither taught nor suggested by any of the cited references.

Claims 1, 7, 11, 14 and 23 have been amended to require:

said alphanumeric message serving as a command input to said smart card used to control operation of said smart card.

Thus, the alphanumeric message is not simply a generic nonfunctional text message. It serves also as a command to the smart card and is used to control operation of the smart card.


Using this technique, the present invention can transmit important commands and security data (such as cryptographic certificates) to a smart card. Such a feature is not shown by the *Manterfield* reference. *Manterfield* simply discloses the existence of SMS messages. As known in the art at the time, an SMS message is merely a text message sent from one person to another for the receiving person to read. There is no disclosure in *Manterfield* of a text message being used to control operation of a smart card. The Office action states that it would have been obvious to one of skill in the art to modify the *Rankl* reference. But, there is no disclosure in *Manterfield* of any motivation to combine an alphanumeric message with the techniques of *Rankl*. Likewise, the Office action has asserted no motivation or desire in *Rankl* for using the

alphanumeric message of *Manterfield* to control operation of a smart card within a mobile telephone handset as required by the currently amended claims.

Applicant requests that the rejection of these claims 1, 7, 11, 14 and 23 be withdrawn.

Reconsideration of this application and issuance of a Notice of Allowance at an early date are respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would in any way expedite prosecution, please do not hesitate to telephone the undersigned at (612) 252-3330.

Respectfully submitted,  
BEYER WEAVER LLP

  
Jonathan O. Scott  
Registration No. 39,364

BEYER WEAVER LLP  
P.O. Box 70250  
Oakland, CA 94612-0250

Telephone: (612) 252-3330  
Facsimile: (612) 825-6304